

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful examination of this application. Claims 1 - 20 are pending. Claims 1-9, and 19-20 are rejected and Claims 10-18 are withdrawn from consideration.

Independent Claim 1 positively recites a cooling conduit disposed along a groove created in the first side, disposed within the channel, and disposed adjacent to the aperture. Claim 1 also positively recites a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit. These advantageously claimed features are not taught or suggested by the patents granted to Leahey et al. or Siegfried et al.; either alone or in combination.

Leahey et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed invention because Leahey et al. does not teach a cooling conduit disposed within the channel nor does Leahey et al. teach a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit (column 9 line 53 through column 10 line 9, FIG S. 10 and 12). The Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action (page 3) that element 1214 teaches both the Applicant's channel (Office Action page 3 lines 3 -4) and the cooling conduit (Office Action page 3 lines 13-16). The Applicant submits that the channel and cooling conduit are separate elements , but the Office Action does not point out

those separate elements (nor does Leahey et al. teach the two advantageously claimed and separate elements).

Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action (pages 3-4) that element 1216 teaches the Applicant's mounting block that is coupled to the cooling conduit (Office Action page 4 lines 2-4). The Applicant submits that Leahey et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed cooling conduit (as explained above); therefore, by definition Leahey et al. does not teach a mounting block that is coupled to that cooling conduit. In addition, the Applicant submits that Leahey et al. specifically teaches that element 1216 is a bulb socket (column 9 line 63), but not a mounting block as asserted in the Office Action (nor does Leahey et al. teach that "the upper most socket (Item 1216) has a larger volume than the other sockets" as asserted in the Office Action). The Applicant also notes that the Office Action points to a single element, namely 908, to teach the advantageously claimed assembly (Office Action bottom of page 2 plus the second side (Office Action page 3 lines 5 -6) and also the mounting block (Office Action page 3 lines 18 -19). Conversely, the Applicant specifically claims an assembly containing the second side and the mounting block as separate elements.

Like Leahey et al., Siegfried et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed invention because Siegfried et al. does not teach a cooling conduit disposed within the channel or a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit

(column 2 line 55 through column 3 line 50, FIG. 1). Therefore, combining the teachings of Leahey et al. and Siegfried does not teach the advantageously claimed elements of a cooling conduit disposed along a groove created in the first side, disposed within the channel, and disposed adjacent to the aperture within the channel and also a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit.

Regarding Claim 9, the Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action (page 4) that “Leahey discloses the groove has a radius substantially equal to the radius of the cooling conduit (FIG. 12 Item 1214).” The Applicant submits that Leahey et al. teaches that element 1214 labeled a ‘channel’ (column 9 line 63); but Leahey et al. does not teach the ‘groove created in the first side’ or the ‘cooling conduit’, that are advantageously claimed as different elements from the ‘channel’.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 1 and respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is patentable over the patents granted to Leahey et al. and Siegfried et al.; either alone or in combination. Furthermore, Claims 2-9 are allowable for depending on allowable independent Claim 1 and, in combination, including limitations not taught or described in the references of record.

Independent Claim 19 positively recites a cooling conduit disposed along a groove created in the first side, disposed within the channel, and disposed adjacent to the aperture . Claim 19 also positively recites a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit. These advantageously claimed features are not taught or suggested by the patents granted to Leahey et al. or Siegfried et al.; either alone or in combination.

Leahey et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed invention because Leahey et al. does not teach a cooling conduit disposed within the channel nor a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit (column 9 line 53 through column 10 line 9, FIGS. 10 and 12). The Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action (pages 8-9) that element 1214 teaches both the Applicant's channel (Office Action page 8) and the cooling conduit (Office Action page 9). The Applicant submits that the channel and cooling conduit are separate elements but the Office Action does not point out those separate elements (nor does Leahey et al. teach the two advantageously claimed and separate elements).

Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action (page 9) that element 1216 teaches the Applicant's mounting block that is coupled to the cooling conduit. The Applicant submits that Leahey et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed cooling conduit (as explained above); therefore, by definition Leahey et al. does not teach a mounting block that is coupled to the

cooling conduit. In addition, the Applicant submits that Leahey et al. specifically teaches that element 1216 is a bulb socket (column 9 line 63), but not a mounting block as asserted in the Office Action (nor does Leahey et al. teach that “the upper most socket (Item 1216) has a larger volume than the other sockets” as asserted in the Office Action on page 9). The Applicant also notes that the Office Action points to a single element, namely 908, to teach the advantageously claimed assembly (Office Action page 8), plus the second side (Office Action page 8) and also the mounting block (Office Action page 9). Conversely, the Applicant specifically claims an assembly containing the second side and the mounting block as separate elements.

Like Leahey et al., Siegfried et al. does not teach the advantageously claimed invention because Siegfried et al. does not teach a cooling conduit disposed within the channel or a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit (column 2 line 55 through column 3 line 50, FIG. 1). Therefore, combining the teachings of Leahey et al. and Siegfried does not teach the advantageously claimed elements of a cooling conduit disposed along a groove created in the first side, disposed within the channel, and disposed adjacent to the aperture within the channel and also a mounting block coupled to the cooling conduit.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 19 and respectfully asserts that Claim 19 is patentable over the patents granted to

Leahey et al. and Siegfried et al.; either alone or in combination. Furthermore, Claim 20 is allowable for depending on allowable independent Claim 19 and, in combination, including limitations not taught or described in the reference s of record.

For the reasons stated above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rose Alyssa Keagy/

Rose Alyssa Keagy
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,095

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. BOX 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
972/917-4167
FAX - 972/917-4409/4418